PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY To: CHARLES N. J. RUGGIERO OHLANDI, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, L.L.P. ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 9TH FLOOR STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT 06901-2682		PCT WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66)	
			93 DEC 1999
Applicant's or agent's file reference 460 1844UPU			ithin TWO months om the above date of mailing
International application No.	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/US99/08668 International Patent Classification (IPC)	20 APRIL 1999		20 APRIL 1998
IPC(6): A61F 13/15; and US Cl.: 60 Applicant PLAYTEX PRODUCTS, INC.			
This opinion contains indications rel Basis of the opinion Priority	ating to the following ite	ms:	
Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of the priority Lack of unity of invertor value and explanations and explanations.	opinion with regard to no	regard to novelty, in	or industrial applicability
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 111 Non-establishment of 1V Lack of unity of inver V Reasoned statement ur titations and explanati	opinion with regard to no ution oder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with ons supporting such state	velty, inventive step	ventive step or industrial applicability;
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 111 Non-establishment of 1V Lack of unity of inver V X Reasoned statement ur citations and explanati VI Certain documents cite VII Certain defects in the i	opinion with regard to no ution oder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with ons supporting such state	regard to novelty, in ment	ventive step or industrial applicability;
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 111 Non-establishment of 1V Lack of unity of inver V X Reasoned statement ur citations and explanati VI Certain documents cite VII Certain defects in the I VIII Certain observations on	opinion with regard to no tition Ider Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with one supporting such state ad International application In the international applica	regard to novelty, in mention and the state of the state	iventive step or industrial applicability; i V E D 5 1999
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 111 Non-establishment of 11V Lack of unity of inver 11V X Reasoned statement uncitations and explanation 11V Certain documents cite 11V Certain defects in the invited to reg 13. The applicant is hereby invited to reg 14When? See the time limit into	opinion with regard to no ader Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with non supporting such state and international application in the international applica- ly to this opinion. icated above. The applies extension, pee Rule 66.2	regard to novelty, in ment DEC 0 c	iventive step or industrial applicability; i V E D 5 1999 PEELEY, 8 PERLE **epiration of that time limit, request this
I X Basis of the opinion II Priority III Non-establishment of IV Lack of unity of inver V X Reasoned statement ur citations and explanati VII Certain documents cite VIII Crain defects in the I VIII Crain in the Common of the Common	der Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with der Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with ons supporting such state of international application in the international applica- toly to this opinion. licated above. The applies extension, see Rule 66.2 en reply, accompanied, w language of the amendm	regard to novelty, in ment DEC 0.6 aution DEC 0.6	iventive step or industrial applicability; i V E D 5 1999 **EELEY. 8 PERLE **spiration of that time limit, request this amendments, according to Rule 66.3. and 66.9.
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 11 Non-establishment of the opinion 12 Lack of unity of invertor of the opinion 21 X Reasond statement unit or invertor of the opinion 22 X Reasond statement unit or invertor opinion of the opinion opinio	opinion with regard to no der Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with one supporting such state d international application in the international applica- ply to this opinion. licated above. The applies extension, see Rule 66.2 are reply, accompanied, we language of the amendm ortunity to submit amend ligation to consider amen	regard to novelty, inventive step regard to novelty, in ment DEC 0 did attion DEC	iventive step or industrial applicability; 1 V E D 1999 SEELEY. 8 PERLE 8 PERLE 9 Perletion of their time limit, request this amendments, according to Rule 66.3. and 66.9.
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 11 Non-establishment of or 12 Non-establishment of or 14 Non-esta	opinion with regard to no tition adder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with ons supporting such state d nternational application in the international applica- ply to this opinion. licated above. The applies extension, peer Rule-66.2 en reply, accompanied, wa anguage of the amendmenturity to submit amend inguistion to consider amen preliminary examination and preliminary	pec que de la constant de la constan	iventive step or industrial applicability; 1 V E D 5 1999 SECICY 8 PERLE Repiration of that time limit, request this amendments, according to Rule 66.3. and 66.9. cents, see Rule 66.4 bis. lished on the basis of this opinion.
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 111 Non-establishment of the opinion 11V Lack of unity of invertor of the opinion 12V X Reasoned statement unit of the opinion 13V Certain documents cite 14V Certain documents cite 15V Certain documents cite 15V Certain doservations of the opinion 15V Certain observations observations of the opinion 15V Certain observations observations observations observa	opinion with regard to no tition adder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with ons supporting such state d nternational application in the international applica- ply to this opinion. licated above. The applies extension, peer Rule-66.2 en reply, accompanied, wa anguage of the amendmenturity to submit amend inguistion to consider amen preliminary examination and preliminary	pec que de la constant de la constan	iventive step or industrial applicability; 1 V E D 5 1999 SECICY 8 PERLE Repiration of that time limit, request this amendments, according to Rule 66.3. and 66.9. cents, see Rule 66.4 bis. lished on the basis of this opinion.
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 11 Non-establishment of or 12 Non-establishment of or 14 Non-establishment of or 14 Non-establishment of or 15 Non-establishment of or 18 Non-establishment of or 18 Non-establishment of	opinion with regard to not tion adder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with most supporting such state at a constant and application in the international application in the examination and preliminary examination and preliminary characteristics.	pec que de la constant de la constan	iventive step or industrial applicability; 1 V E D 5 1999 SECICY 8 PERLE Repiration of that time limit, request this amendments, according to Rule 66.3. and 66.9. cents, see Rule 66.4 bis. lished on the basis of this opinion.
1 X Basis of the opinion 11 Priority 11 Non-establishment of 1V Lack of unity of inver V Reasoned statement ur citations and explanati VI Certain documents cite VII Certain documents cite VIII Certain documents cite VIII Certain observations on 3. The applicant is hereby invited to rey When? See the time limit ind Authority-to-grant-an How? By submitting a write For the form and the Also For an additional opin If no reply is filed, the unternationa 4. The final date by which the internatio examination report must be establishe	opinion with regard to not tion adder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with most supporting such state at a constant and application in the international application in the examination and preliminary examination and preliminary characteristics.	regard to novelty, inventive step regard to novelty, in ment DEC 0 distance of the second of the se	iventive step or industrial applicability; V E D

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

	10001	

				PC 1/0399/08668
I. Bas	is of	the opinion		
1. This of invitati	oinion ion un	has been drawn on der Article 14 are r	the basis of (Substitute sheets which have been furnishe eferred to in this opinion as "originally filed".):	ed to the receiving Office in response to an
	х	the international	l application as originally filed.	
	х	the description,	pages 1-14 , as originally filed. pages NONE , filed with the deman pages NONE , filed with the letter of	
	X	the claims,	Nos. 1-26 , as originally filed. Nos. NONE , as amended under Ar Nos. NONE , filed with the demand or filed. Nos. NONE , filed with the letter or filed.	i. ·
	х	the drawings,	sheets/fig 1-4 , as originally filed sheets/fig NONE , filed with the det sheets/fig NONE , filed with the lett	mand.
2. The ar	mend	ments have result	ed in the cancellation of:	
l	х	the description,	pagesNONE	
	x	the claims,	Nos. NONE	
[х	the drawings, s	heets /fig NONE	
3.	This to go	opinion has been of beyond the disclos	established as if (some of) the amendments had not b sure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Ac	een made, since they have been considered diditional observations below (Rule 70.2(c)).
4. Addit	ional	observations, if	necessary:	

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US99/08668

Su	ople	men	tal	Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 10

TIME LIMIT:

THE TIME LIMIT SET FOR RESPONSE TO A WRITTEN OPINION MAY NOT BE EXTENDED. 37 CFR 1.484(D). ANY RESPONSE RECEIVED AFTER THE EXPRIATIONS OF THE TIME LIMIT SET IN THE WRITTEN OPINION WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED IN PREPARING THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINATE YEARINFOR REPORT.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

V B		PCT/US99/08668	
v. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(citations and explanations supporting	a)(ii) with re such statem	egard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applications	bility;
 STATEMENT 			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-26	
	Claims	NONE	_ YES
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims	NONE	_ 110
	Claims	1-26	YES NO
			NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims	1-26	
	Claims	NONE	YES NO
CITATIONS AND EXPLANATION			
sieve having a natural zeolite of the elinophiloli al. disclose the natural zeolite, elinophilolite use Lamensdorf et al. in Marcus et al. to obtain the Claims 2-16, as to the embodiments listed in th such structural relationships unexpectedly provi structures of lamensdorf et al. penetsetted.	te species with d in water pur properties giv ese claims it it de a new resu d. As such th g evidence to t	us absorbent article for absorbing body fluids comprising a a nolecular sieve disposed within the fibrous meta at an 2 lines 25-30). Marcus et al. do not disclose the molecul h potassium as a primary exchangeable cation. Lamensdorf rification. It would have been obvious to place the compour certain the claimed invention. In would have been obvious to place the compour certain the claimed invention. In snoted that the applicant's specification does not set forth it it or unexpectedly solve any problem in the art over the es selection of these specific elements are considered an obvithe contrary, the language does not patentably distinguish over the contrary, the language does not patentably distinguish or contrary.	ar et nd of